

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-31 were originally pending. The Office Action rejected claims 1-13 and 17-31 and objected to dependent claims 14, 15, and 16 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Those three dependent claims were each deemed allowable, however, if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, the applicant has simply elected to secure a patent including claims reciting the subject matter already deemed allowable by the Examiner. Therefore, independent claim 1 was amended to include the subject matter of claim 14 (and, therefore, claim 14 has been canceled). Independent claim 19 was amended to recite the combined subject matter of original claims 1 and 15 (and, therefore, claim 15 has been canceled). New claim 34 recites the combined subject matter of original claims 1 and 16 (and, therefore, claim 16 has been canceled).

Original claims 2-13, 17, and 18 depended from independent claim 1 and, after amendment merely to correct technical errors, they continue to so depend. Original claims 20-31 depended from independent claim 19 and, after amendment merely to correct technical errors, they continue to so depend. New claims 32 and 33 depend from independent claim 19 and recite the same subject matter as claims 17 and 18, respectively. New claims 35-48 depend from independent claim 34 and parallel claims 2-13, 17, and 18 (and claims 20-33).

Thus, the pending claims now include three separate but parallel claims strings. The first claim string includes claims 2-13, 17, and 18 depending from independent claim 1 (which recites the allowable subject matter of original claims 1 and 14). The second claim string includes claims 20-33 depending from independent claim 19 (which recites the allowable subject matter of original claims 1 and 15). The third claim string includes claims 35-48 depending from independent claim 34 (which recites the allowable subject matter of original claims 1 and 16). These claim relationships are highlighted in the following Table.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Application No. 10/821,938
Response to Office Action of October 7, 2005

182685-0013
(formerly RFID-0111)

CLAIM STRING 1

CLAIM STRING 2

CLAIM STRING 3


Amended Claim	Original Claim(s)	Amended or New Claim	Original Claim(s)	New Claim	Original Claim(s)
1 (Indep.)	1 + 14	19 (Indep.)	1 + 15	34 (Indep.)	1 + 16
2	2	20	20 = 2	35	20 = 2
3	3	21	21 = 3	36	21 = 3
4	4	22	22 = 4	37	22 = 4
5	5	23	23 = 5	38	23 = 5
6	6	24	24 = 6	39	24 = 6
7	7	25	25 = 7	40	25 = 7
8	8	26	26 = 8	41	26 = 8
9	9	27	27 = 9	42	27 = 9
10	10	28	28 = 10	43	28 = 10
11	11	29	29 = 11	44	29 = 11
12	12	30	30 = 12	45	30 = 12
13	13	31	31 = 13	46	31 = 13
None	14 (Canceled)	32	17	47	17
None	15 (Canceled)	33	18	48	18
None	16 (Canceled)				
17	17				
18	18				

The applicant respectfully submits that each of pending claims 1-13 and 17-48 is in condition for allowance. In fact, the Examiner has already deemed allowable the subject matter recited in these claims. By this Response, the applicant has also amended the specification to further prosecution of the subject application without introducing new matter. Entry of this Response is requested.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should all be withdrawn. Favorable action is earnestly solicited. Finally, the Examiner is invited to call the applicant's undersigned representative if any further action will expedite the prosecution of the application or if the Examiner has any suggestions or questions concerning the application or the present Response.

In fact, if the claims of the application are not believed to be in full condition for allowance, for any reason, the applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner in drafting one or more acceptable claims pursuant to MPEP § 707.07(j) or in making constructive suggestions pursuant to MPEP § 706.03 so that the application can be placed in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin R. Casey, Reg. No. 32,117
Kevin W. Goldstein, Reg. No. 34,608
Attorneys for Applicant

KRC:lk:kak

Enclosures: Substitute Specification with Revision Marks; and
 Substitute Specification with Revision Marks Accepted

Dated: December 19, 2005

Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young, LLP
Great Valley Corporate Center
30 Valley Stream Parkway
Malvern, PA 19355-1481
(610) 640-5800

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment for any additional fee which may be required or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502951

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

December 19, 2005

